BRA
549
...y Of
...OPMENT AUTHORITY
...Library
BOS...

Transcript of the BRA-MIT Urban Dynamics
Advisory Committee Inc.

Dialogue Series on Planning and Development
For Boston's Future

Parkman Conference Center Program Feb. 7, 1974

Navy Yard Reuse

Gerry Bush: The base was closed on April 17th by the then Secretary of Defense, Elliott Richardson. On the 18th we started asking for money, when I say we it is the group that basically came together is a combination of the BRA staff and our staff: the economic development corporation. We do have a city wide task force and neighborhood advisory groups, but the base is a phenomenon in the development of the city which is unequaled, in my opinion by anything except perhaps the fire in 1867, or the 36 years to make the Back Bay fill.

Basically it is 220 acres of real estate in Charlestown and South Boston; 130 acres of water and 7.3 million sq. ft. of buildings. One building alone, the army base building which will be declared surplus in the South Boston site, is 1,651,000 sq. ft. of space. The New England Merchants is about 800,000 sq. ft. of space, to give you a comparision. The Prudential Center is 31 acres and 3.5 million sq. ft. of space. So the real estate is 10 times the size of the Prudential Center. The buildings in place now are twice the size of the entire Prudential Tower. The Park Plaza project is 35 acres, so just in terms of size it's substantial.

In terms of employment there were 20,000 employees there during the Second World War, the defense department cut it down to 5,600 in April, and it's down to about 1,000 now, Everyone will be laid off by the end of May or June, they're slipping a little on their closing schedule. So we'll have zero employment there. In a redevelopment program if we could have everybody's best hope come in we might have 20,000 jobs.

The cost of the base is of course a political process if indeed a public agency buys it. The GSA now has title on the property. They will notify the state and the city that it is available and ask if we want to purchase it. If we pay rock bottom prices for the dollar per sq. ft. for the building, you're talking about $15,000,000 - 50¢ per sq. ft. for the land, 10¢ for the water and $1.00 for the buildings. If you pay fair market value, that is if you compare all the space to recent industrial sales at around $4 00 per sq. ft. for the buildings and $3 to $4 for the land, and 50¢ for the water, you're going to be paying $53,000,000. There's some heavy machinery that will be left. The layout of the facility is very antique to say the least.

The good land is in South Boston, all the equipment is in Charlestown. At this point we are following two, not necessarily opposing policies, but we're following two paths in an attempt to get a handle on the problem of this magnitude. One of which is characterised as an entreprenurial solution to the problem this is why I was so anxious to speak with this group and indeed with any of your institutions where you think it might be worth while. We've talked with three of the four banks. We've talked with three or four chamber groups, trying to make the private sector in the city aware of the base in some detail, so that when they know of deals being made in the private sector, they will be thinking about the base as a possible physical site for new operations or expanded operations.

The entreprenurial solution involves ship building. There has been a substantial amount of unfortunate publicity about the Boston Ship Building Corp. We continue to work with them to see if indeed we can get ship building started. Another major ship builder was in yesterday, who's very interested in going forward. It's his opinion that he needs $200,000,000 in new ship orders, to go ahead he feels he can develop that in about 60 days. There is no capacity in ship yards today. If you can guarantee delivery or promise delivery, by 1976 or 1977, there are all kinds of people out there who will give you orders. If you can get that piece together with the capital that's required, then you can start ship building on a shoe string. If we can get the real estate delivered. Those three pieces go together, two of which have to happen in the private sector and only one in the public sector. Then we indeed will create 45,000 jobs in the long term, about 1,500 immediately and utilize about 80% of the physical real estate.

On that same notion, we have a contract with Arthur D. Little, examining in a preliminary way the feasibility of what we call a medical/dental pharmaceutical product center. The concept

N.Y.
b65R.N

that they're looking at is a trademart for medical, dental, pharmaceutical products. There is no such institution in the U.S. there's none in the world, where a doctor, a hospital administrator, the nurses etc., the food service people can go to one physical location and look at the variety of products that are available to them. It's the model of the furniture mart in Chicago, which a substantial in percent of the wholesale transactions take place. anufacturing may have been in South Carolina, but the retailor goes to Chicago to look at everything that is available. We are interviewing suppliers andmanufacturers to test whether or not there's something in the market that has prevented it from happening before. It seems like a fundamentally good idea, why hasn't it happened? We're trying to find out why it hasn't happened of we can. If not, HEW has told us they would put in a regional training center in the Charlestown sector, and we could in fact preserve the facade of the ship yard and that use would be the most compatible with the park.

Marcia will talk more about the South End of the Charlestown yard which we hope will become the U.S.S. Constitution park.

The entrepreneurial third soultion, which is even more far fetched, is a proposal which we received yesterday to work out a "Hertz Rent A Boat" for commercial fishing. No onw has spent a lot of time on the economics of the fishing industry, but one of the problems is the high capital cost. If we could create a kind of an institution to manufacture fishing vessels, and lease them to operators you put in a tremendous amount of leverage at two or three critical points in the economics of fishing industry.

That's one tack we're one. Is there enough energy and risk taking in the private sector? Can we connect to someone who has an idea or a concept and the private capital large enough to do something worthwile with the base?

Simultaneously, we have let contracts to do what I call the plan and developmental approac If we get into that program it will take at least a decade. Brooklyn has been sitting there for 10 years, about 40% utilized now. Watertown in our own backyard has been there for 5 years. But of course what you can do with it depends in large part what you pay for it. One opinion is that they paid $22M too much for Brooklyn. Watertown paid about $5M too much for that facility. These two buildings are basically rentless, and if they sit idle they're naked because of the destruction that sets in rapidly. So we're simultaneously trying to put our eggs in two baskets. One is developing our plan, which interfaces well with the a butting communities, and talks about highest and best use. And we're trying to get real capital uses there so that the plan doesn't become totally unreal. If both those fail, I don't know what's going to happen. If the problem gets defined as Kevin White's then the region is in real trouble. If the citizens of the area say this is the politicans problem, it will be a grevious error. There is no way that city or state government can solve those problems. We are going to have to identify uses and sources of private capital, in order to convert these facilities. We don't have that kind of bread in the city hall. The implications of our putting out $53M in general obligation funds, is staggering. In order to own a piece of real estate that has a $4M a year maintenancetag on it with nothing going on, and just to preserve it, it will cost $4M per year. There are other problems with it, the telephone and electric wires are in the same conduit, so those two systems must be segregated, because the telephone company won't repair facilities that are intergrated, that's probably a $2M ticket. It costs $1M a year to just run the power plant in Charlestown. Nobody knows how the oil gets from the storage tanks to the furnace. Whan a facility that was created in 1790 and has grown through all the wars that have been fought since then is closed it is a mess. Let me show you some of the mess. (SLIDES OF FACILITIES WERE SHOWN.)

This was a very superficial ride through there, the purpose all of which is to see the size and complexity of the place. It's a great development opportunity for the city. When you get high on whatever you get high on, you can imagine all kinds of wonderful things happening in terms of new employment, new employment, new tax generation.

More on the positive side, things that we hope can happen, and I hope will happen in which we're down to a fairly detailed level of planning, is the U.S.S. Constitution Park, that Marshall from the BRA has been working with almost full time since April. The BRA had done some preliminary planning a couple of years ahead on this venture.

SALE PRICE

Question: The reuse sale price, has that been established?

Gerry Bush: No, the GSA took title and control of the property last week. They will price it now.

Question: On what basis, reuse ot present use?

Gerry Bush: They will appraise it on the highest use, which is somebody's idea. We have already offered to take it if they'll pay us $25M. I have not been anxious to bring that to a head, I am anxious to slow down the federal process rather than speed them up. Even though defense keeps saying speed it up, it's in your interest to get it immediately. I would rather defense hold it, because it's really a hot potato, as long as they've got a hold of it we've got some time to do things.

New Speaker: In New York City the annual capital budget is several hundred million dollars a year, so they were prepared to take a risk and spend the $50 odd million of their own money to purchase the navy yard outright.

USE BY THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

New Speaker: One other question, the school department I understand has an interest in the naval yard annex for an occupational resource center. I don't know whether they're working with you or working individually.

Gerry Bush: Individually. It's a silly situation, it could only happen in Boston. Kerrigan some months ago, said he wanted to take over all of Charlestown for educational use. I said can we try to sit down and analyse it. I found out that they want a million sq. ft. to take the ORC and put it into Charlestown. We gave a tour to all their membership, and we never heard back from them, and the only communications we had are the newspapers. Every time I read the newspaper I call Kerrigna's office and ask what do you want to do.

New Speaker: The ship building thing, they're talking about the entire base in Charlestown and South Boston?

New Speaker: We're talking about 50% of Charlestown area and all of South Boston

IS SHIP BUILDING A GOOD IDEA?

New Speaker: Okay, forget Marshall's plan but in essence it couldn't be anything except for a foundation and the ship yards, is that right? Does this still make sense to you, to use all the land for a ship building operation?

Gerry Bush: No it doesn't, in an abstract way. But in a concrete way the answer is yes it does. If I were in an economy where anything were predictable so you could get raw materials and mortgage money. If we had some national policy where we were predicting some substantial growth in the New England regional economy, a mix of light manufacturing and assembly, a mixture of development, would be a much more progressive thing for the city. Our office is predicting and realizes there is some controversy between the two city agencies.- a decrease in regional gross product.

We know when we surveyed private businessmen about expansion, that they're thinking about it but they're postponing those decisions until something firms up. They ask will I be able to get energy? Can I get steam? What are my costs going to be? In this kind of environment a mixture of development doesn't seem to be very real. And therefore ship building which we knowhas peaks and valleys, and is not a terribly labor intensive effort is viable. If it can happen it will give us a decade before we have to want some other kind of a reuse. And if it's very successful and continues to grow, it is a good employer. It's like an 80 year old man when asked how he feels about being 90 says "well given the alternative it's great." We don't have a whole lot of alternatives, since April there's been a lot of publicity about the base. We have in hand interest expressed in about a million sq. ft. We've done a lot of talking about this but still we've only created 1/7 of the interest level. We've created no other comprehensive interest. The only other comprehensive concept is the medical center, and it's only a concept.

New Speaker: Does Drapper ever come back to you?

Gerry Bush: No, Drapper was looking at 500,000 sq. ft. I have been led to believe they have a very tempting development proposal on the desk. They've hired local experts to evaluate it against all others. It seems that that conclusion will favor that new development, they want to be very realistic. I should also say the Massport Authority, which is in and around Boston, is interested in 11 acres in South Boston, to tear down the fish pier and relocate the fish pier there. They want to see the figures before they say yes. Paul has been saying well we can't do the numbers until Gerry tells us you can have that real estate. I say I can't tell you about real estate because I don't know if- so why don't you get your numbers and we keep yelling and screaming at each other. If we don't get ship building and fishing, a new piece of real estate dedicated to fish processing would be a viable solution. The Coast Guard is very interested in exactly the same piece of real estate, only they want 25 acres. They're now on 4.4 acre parcel in Mattapan. We would like to see them out. With no increase in jobs, no increase in services, the Coast Guard wants to go 4.4 acres to 25 acres. It seems

universal to us, and it's the kind of a decision only a public agency would give, no private one would. We have to date opposed that because it's 25 acres of good real estate that would be tax exempt. We are kind of opposed to Massport in all of this because it is sometimes difficult in knowing what Massport has. We want land taxable, and want to create employment, and given their track record in South Boston, for they own almost all of South Bo now, it's all mainly warehousing and the Pappas development in South Boston on Massport leases have mainly been warehouses, we're going to try to create more employment, We are not anxious for Massport to take acres, from the city of Boston and take it out of taxation, no tax comes from fisheries.

Paul: Not now, when they took it under their original act those properties were tax exempt.

Gerry: What we said Paul, we are looking at a container port in South Boston. I don't know if a container port is needed. There are two studies, Massport's says yes and ours says no. Somewhere in between there is probably the truth. The impact in terms of truck traffic is very heavy, and there is very little employment. So Boston is going to have to subsidize the port facilities so New Hampshire manufacturerscan get their goods to Europe faster. You feel a little used in that process, because there are no jobs and no taxes.

New Speaker: The Port has never asked you for the entire South Boston facility.

Gerry: No. They talked about the fishing industry.

New Speaker: The fishing industry is 11 but maybe up to 25...

Gerry: They said they will pick that up.

New Speaker: They always said they would pay full taxes.

GerryNow the issue is the East Boston Container facility, is South Boston a better site for that or is it better outside...

New Speaker: But that's not part of the naval base.

Gerry: The South Boston site is looked at by the Maynard Study which Massport commissioned to find a place for the facility.

New Speaker: They threw it out and said it should be over on the East Boston site.

Gerry: We have the word that South Boston comes out very strongly in that competition.

New Speaker: Not according to the report.

THE U.S.S. CONSTITUTION PARK

Marcia Myers:The idea came out of the Charlestown community about 4 years ago, they were concerned because they had heard the operations in Charlestown were going to move to South Boston, what was going to become of the Constitution, there was a proposal for the constitutic to be at long wharf. Charlestown didn't like that at all. They came to the BRA and said don' move the Constitution. We did a study and found that in fact the ship yard is s significant sight and worthy of conclusion in the parks system. 1973 and the base closing and the idea came up again and we then brought BRA proposal up-to-date, and submitted it again to the natic parks service. The parks service had been encouraged by the navy to create a park in about 1/ of the land area of the ship yard. The parks service carried out a preliminary management and use study and is preparing a more detailed plan, management, operating and budget to take to Congress in the spring.

It looks pretty good, the parks system said this has been one of the most unusual proposals for a new addition to the national parks system in that there is no opposition. In brief, what it does is features Constitution but goes further. It does have in cooperation with the U.S.S. Constitution foundation a museum which will expand the exhibit which will be made into a ship. But then in addition there will be exbibits pertaining to the history of th ship yards, the dry dock, and the other facilities. The attention on our part being that we would hope that not only Constitution be enhanced but that we can extent the time of the visit to the Constitution and therefore to the city from approximatly 1/2 hour trip to a half a day visit. Things look fairly good as far as planners are concerned we hope that parts of this will be in to the ship yard within the next year.

New Speaker: There will be a concerted effort on our part to solicite your support, and we'll be back to you. We are going to have to develop community support for the park.

New Speaker: Now has the national parks association set up a New England regional headquarters here yet?

Marcia: Yes, they have a headquarters and have moved in.

New Speaker: This means they would consolidate the permanent New England base here.

Marcia: Yes, I think that was a separate move but it does show both the Charlestown side and the Boston National Park, six sites and the freedom trail.

New Speaker: Next question, how do you really, using the navy personnel, have they made any

commitments about maintaining the Constitution?
Marcia: Yes, there will be a cooperative agreement, the navy will maintain the ship.
Gerry: Ten more words on that ship building idea, it's precisely why I've been talking to banks and insurance companies, and chamber of commerce groups hoping that somebody out there if somebody else wants to come in and work with us to develop the mixture of manufacturing other stuff, we've got to find them. Somebody in the private sector has got to come to us.
New Speaker: I agree with what you're stating, but what distressed me is that Boston ship building is insisting that they've got to have the entire area or they can't operate.
Gerry: You mean all of South Boston...
New Speaker: All of South Boston, and what you can give them in Charlestown so if you listen to Lloyd there's no room for anything else, period, I don't happen to agree with it, but I'm just curious.
Gerry: When you really get down to dollars and cents he won't agree with it, because he's going to have to lease that space, he's not going to be leasing space he doesn't want.
Hank Emerson: Chip, any similarities between this and [redacted] Textile Mills?
Chip: Too many. You take valuable real estate with structural albatrosses, so I guess the parallel between Boston and New York in its limited fiscal ability certainly continues when you talk about Lowell. Most people agree that it would be nice to clear away some of the land the mills stand on and make available some of the contributions of the cost of turning out those mills is really prohibitive. They were built six feet thick at the base, and the facilities are pretty out dated. The cost of tearing them down, each mill is something in excess of $1M, and the city doesn't seem to be talking too seriously about spending a million dollars on the hope that some revestment will reoccur in the future.
New Speaker: The only thing that they've got that the Boston navy yard doesn't have is they don't have the 45 foot ceilings, they have 4 and 6 foot ceilings. They have a whole floor of 4 foot ceilings where they used to store cotton bales. It's hard to find people small enough to work there.
Hank: Do you want to wind up the city's presentation?
Gerry: The only other thing I want to point out is if you have other groups, if you think the slide show and just a presentation on the base would be helpful to your constiuents, or your company or some professional group, please ask.

In May the navy's out. GSA has it now, the Title 10, which is a formal congressional body finding it clear, so it's now at GSA.. GSA is in the process of gearing up the appraisal. When things will happen depends on whether we sue, or whether we go in fast or slow, it's a political process. GSA is the disposition agency, within 30 to 60 days they'll be talking to the state and city to tell them that we're interested. Hopefully we'll get somewhere by early fall.
Hank: The truth of the matter is that right now we don't have any real hard deals.
New Speaker: I wish to say something about Senator Backman's proposal.
Gerry: I wish he had talked to us before. Where we don't talk to each other is in Massachusetts Backman is hearing testimony right now to authorize the Massport Authority to look at South Boston. Flagstone did a study of the South Boston site and recommended ship building. It's second best use in terms of impact on the city was a mixture of lending factory warehousing or whatever you can scrape together. They did look at a few trad subsidies, study which required has already been made, it doesn't look very favorable. 12 of the 13 free trades were loosing money, with substantial public subsidies behind them. The city again because of it's fiscal situation can't end up subsidizing a free trade building. I'm assuming you know what free trades are, basically the import and export thing without getting American duties if you have a manfacturer, if we are talking to a European pharmaceutical company which is desperate to get into this market. If we could get two of them lined up we would be very close to the free trade zone. If you declare a free trade zone and build a fence people will not be beating down you door to get in there. There are 13 in this country and they're not full yet, so just building it will not automatically attract the market. If we can get a couple of companies, then we can go for free trade zone, which really is the prime tenant to establish one, and a prime tenantfor whome the free trade zone is a incentive. If we can develop one of those through this medical-dental center, and we have had interest in it, but it will be run by Massport, becuase they're the only agency in the Commonwealth that has been authorized to apply.
New Speaker: The park line is not a cut, the primary use of it would be for ship building, but did you say you don't have a ship builder interested in either of the two sites?

Gerry: We have two ship builders.
New Speaker: They can build a commerical vehicle in there, a tanker, etc.
Gerry: You can not build super tanks, that is the 250,000 tons dead weight, but you can build a lotof other things.
New Speaker: Again, that would be your preference for the use of the two sites, ship building.
Gerry: Given that everything that's given now remain. The number one principle in base conversion is it's much easier to convert stronger economy than it is in a weak one,
New Speaker: Can I ask one quick question, getting into the other use. In Charlestown, Eli, say if Marcia's foundation comes up with the money, where's the entrance going to be to Charlestown, can you do this without disrupting the community?
Eli Post: We're looking at alternatives for providing particular access into that portion of the Charlestown area that would be used for industrial purposes. I think we can achieve it with respecting the area as a historical portion and that the resident community remains to the side.

URBAN SYSTEMS

Lou Alfeld: I have two things to talk about, one is I want to make a few comments about the paper I wrote today, and the other thing is the work that I'm doing now with the BRA people.

As far as the navy yard goes, in view of the past analysis that I've done in terms of balancing jobs and people in the city. In one of the BRA handouts there is an area in Charlestown noted for possible residential use. In the paper I said it might be possible to put in some high income residential use as opposed to lower or moderate, or federal income. The work that's going on in the housing study, it may not be a good idea even to put in high-income housing out there of the high density type. If you're looking ahead to expanding the family population, as opposed to either high income elderly people in high rise towers or high income young singles, or young married in high towers, you've got to be able to create the housing for the families, if you can live in the city. It's not clear yet whether that conversation in Charlestown, demolishing the buildings and putting up single family homes on half acres sites, we really essentially compete for suburbs so that's still an open question.

Several weeks ago, we talked about housing in Boston, and I've done a simple study of the housing trends since that time I've been working very closely with Kent Colton and Rolf Goertze on developing a housing model. Essentially what it is it divides all the housing stock in Boston into a high, middle and low income categoryy, and further subdivides those categories of housing into what we call masionary housing, which is the stuff built before the turn of the century - Back Bay, Beacon Hill, South End -housing that is basically structurally sound and is amenable to rehabilitation. Next is what we call wood structure housing - which is mostly the three deckers in Boston, most of the old wooden things are more difficult and expensive to rehabilitation and generally age more quickly once they get down to the bottom of the market. It's hard to bring them back up. And what we call the high density housing which are the newer post war construction, either garden apartments or high rise towers whatever the name may be, but it's mostly the newer stuff that is on much higher density sties that the wooden stuff. What we've been looking at is how that market and how thehousing was distributed in 1960, what were all of the constructions, demolitions and conversion, and what the housing market is in 1970.

We;ve got data for those three things. The 60's stock, the 70's stock and what happened between 60 and 70. We try to tune the model to reflect the changes between 60 and 70. We int to do two things. One is to make a simple projection based on what happenedbetween 60 and 70, if those market forces continue what does it look like in 80, and secondaly to begin to play with particular policy changes to see what we now expect from specific housing policies from the city to change the housing stock. Now actually this is more than a housing model in the sense that it does have income groups in it, and out of the model we do make projection about population who's going to be living in the housing, how many people of different income catergories and different kinds of housing, what you might call population densities, the number of people per unit in the wood frame structures as opposed to high rise apartment and that population density varied for income groups. We are also putting in numbers for labor force participation, for each residential unit that filled up with a family, how many people in that family are actually participating in the labor force. And so far at least the number are fitting together and I hope that in 2 to 4 weeks to have a report out that we'll be able to discuss at one of the meetings.

This is closly tied to a second effort that I've been working with Alex Ganz and members of his staff on goals for Boston in trying to make an assessment of the balance between

jobs; housing and people as far as projections goes in looking for consistencies and consistencies and possible goal projections. Both I and the BRA staff are just getting started on that, there's really nothing to report right now, it's been an area of mutual learning. I expect that the things I'm doing right now which are not related so much to deep analysis for the navy yard or Columbia Point, a lot of these things are being handled by very specific staff and I've been devoting my efforts to long term broader planning. That is where the effort is going now, and I hope that will be showing some fruits of the effort within four weeks, and probably longer for the goals.

GOALS

Hank: We've still got ten minutes, maybe you'd like to question Lou on some of the work he's doing. When you talk about goals, what kind of goals do you feel are lacking, what sort of goals are you working on?

Lou: I'm not so sure that goals are lacking. One of the problems in goals setting is everybody talking with the same sematics. What is a goal? And what are you really trying to accomplish? We are in the process of defining what is the population goal for 1980, how many people does they city want to have in 1980? Is that a number that we can specify or isn't it? And once you have population then you can talk about distribution of population as far as income groups and housing. The process is one of making sure that all of the goals that you're striving for are all consistent with one another, that you're not creating 30% more housing in the expectation of only a 10% rise in population, or vice versa. That is a difficult process to get all of the pieces together. We're still trying to come up with the numbers to find out even if there are discrepencies in some areas.

Hank: Any questions for Lou?

New Speaker: Do your goals concern themselves with economic factors, the way the city should look in terms of investment, income, etc?

Lou: What we're looking for in terms of goals, would be population as distributed by income groups. Housing stock distributed by equality, income groups and jobs as distributed bu skill categories, looking particularly at the rate of upward economic mobility for people at the bottom of the ladder moving up, jobs available for people to move up through the socio-economic ladder. I guess that's at the first cut. When we'll go back from there to see how specific goals relate to policies now in the process of being formulated. Policies for education, for job creation, for investment all of these things are subsidiary to a main goal of how to do you want the city to look.

New Speaker: In terms of a population distribution by income, is that the goal?

Lou: It's one way of stating a goal, you could make a statement now that say by definition we could say the city's divided 1/3,1/3,1/3. A third of the people are at the bottom, and a third are in the upper part. How do you want that present distribution--I'd expect it to change in the next ten years, how would you like for it to change? And if you'd like part of that distribution to wind up with more people at the top and more people in the middle and fewer in the bottom, which gives a goal, try and set how much and then what strategies are compatible with moving people in one direction or the other.

New Speaker: The city's made up of people, isn't there a goal that's more basic than that. What do the people look towards, health, happiness and wealth. Isn't there something as basic as that when you work with their resources to attain that before you get to the people themselves?

Lou: Well health and happiness for who, for how many people? The overall goal might be to improve the quality of urban life. At that point it is very general. What improves the quality of urban life? How do you translate it into something we can measure? You don't just legislate the quality of urban life, one of the things you do is to reduce poverty. (People believe the reduction in poverty will also reduce crime.) We'll be discussion the different problems, but I think the BRA has chosen a good place to start: how many people do you have? How many houses do you have?

New Speaker: The people you consider are residents of Boston, do you consider people in Boston for other periods of time, like working during the day, so that you get a universe of people and say what's best for them, or are you only dealing with Boston residents?

Lou: Right now we're just dealing with Boston residents.

New Speaker: What Gerry said is pretty clear - he's got a piece of land with some structures on it and he want to put it to use as soon as possible.

Lou: Well I don't think that's really true, I think what he's looking for is put it to a use that benefits Boston.

New Speaker: I said first of all to put it to use.
Lou: Well now it doesn't benefit the city, you could make it a garbage dump or a target range for the navy. There are lots of uses that he might be able to get that's he's not interested in getting at all, he'd rather see it remain idle.
Gerry: We got a proposal for a scrap yard.
New Speaker: I think the issue between the population goal and a population limit as a means to a goal is important, and I think a population goal by itself doesn't mean anything and maybe that's part of the problem. I think that Lou would probably agree with me on that statement. The problem in looking at cities historically is that cities havn't set a population constraint for themselves. In trying to address the problems of the many different groups that exist, particularly the low income groups in the city, usually what happens is that you design housing, low income housing and low income job training programs or a whole range of programs to attempt the low income population, which in the final analysis draw in more low income people for the city than the programs can sustain, so that you have more low income people competing for the same limited number of low income jobs. More low income people, really an expanding supply of low income housing.

If you acknowledge there is a initimate relationship between the population balance and the total population within the community and that quality of life, you stand a much better chance for a real benefit for your city resident. If instead every policy tends only to increase city population so the number of jobs go up or the housing quality goes up but the average doesn't benefit because there are that many more people ther competing for it, then maybe you're just repeating the mistakes of the past and that's something urban dynamics is trying to avoid.
New Speaker: I just want to know what are you trying to attain?
New Speaker: I would like to submit that that's a pretty limited goal because if you don't consider all of us in the city then we come out as objectives of whatever policy...
Hank: Transportation is the kind of issue that is a non resident...
New Speaker: There is a tremendous commitment by the BRA not only to work in Boston but to extensions outside the city. I don't see goal setting in itself. I think the important first step is only that, that what it does is really provide a more rational basis for decision making and that's a goal in itself.
Lou: To add to that, the overall population goal is not independent of all those other issues, such as the distribution of that population as far as income groups, distribution of housing, all of those together, form one consistent package that makes a goal. Once you know what it is you'd like to have the city do, then you can evaluate these other policies that you're talking about in terms of transportation or anything else that impacts the metropolitan area and decide whether the particular policy in the city moves the city towards its goal or away from it, and that gives you a basis for evaluating city policy, which is really what we're talking about here. Does the city by taking certain action bring itself closer to a goal which helps its residents or is it moving further away?
Hank: Well it sounds like you've got a good start on one aspect on base closing, and an inventory on what's happened over the last nine years.
New Speaker: Who's given direction to this study?
Lou: Everyone is contributing something to an ongoing conversation, there is a paper that was authored by one of the BRA people on some preliminary goals.
Hank: Ultimately what Lou is doing is to look at housing if the direction we're heading... is that consistant with some of the things we're going to do. A goal might be a consistency of balance and not necessarily a goal of increased of 50,000 people in a certain income category in the next 10 years but a goal of a population that might balance the other attributed that we seem to be finding for the city. We don't have the right to say how many people should live in the city.
New Speaker: The suburbs do, why not the city?
Hank: I don't know that they do that now.

Adjourn

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 06314 416 4

CHARLESTOWN B65R.N
BRA-MIT Urb Dynam Adv Com
Parkman Conf. Ctr. Program:
Navy Yard Reuse.

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library